

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 remain pending in the application.

Claims 1-3, 5, 10-15, 17-21, 23, 25 and 26 over Iyengar

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5, 10-15, 17-21, 23, 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,349,213 to Iyengar ("Iyengar"). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 1-3, 5, 19-21, 23, 25 and 26 recite digital audio encoded using a first encoding scheme transmitted in a first direction **simultaneously with digital audio** encoded using a second encoding scheme transmitted in a second direction. Claims 10-13 recite provision of a first radio frequency bandwidth for transmission of encoded digitized audio data from a base unit to a corresponding remote handset, and provision of a second radio frequency bandwidth different from the first radio frequency bandwidth, for transmission of encoded digitized audio data from the remote handset to the base unit, wherein the first radio frequency bandwidth is **utilized simultaneously with the second radio frequency bandwidth**. Claims 14 and 15 recite a digital cordless telephone system operable to utilize an audio encoding scheme of a first type **simultaneously with a different audio encoding scheme of a second type**. Claims 17 and 18 recite using digital audio encoded using a first analog-to-digital conversion precision transmitted in a first direction **simultaneously with digital audio** encoded using a second analog-to-digital conversion precision transmitted in a second direction.

Iyengar teaches the adaptability of a multi-handset cordless phone which changes voice encoding in ALL directions based on a number of handsets currently off-hook. For instance, the flow chart of Fig. 4 shows that a decision is made as to whether only a single handset is off-hook, or if multiple handsets are off-hook. If only one handset of the multi-handset cordless telephone is off-hook, then the otherwise standard ADPCM coding is utilized in BOTH directions. However, if multiple handsets are off-hook at the same time, the single RF channel is 'split' between the handsets in use by moving ALL components (i.e.,

both handsets and the base unit) to a HIGHER compression algorithm that will function in only a portion of the RF channel.

This enables preservation of the highest voice quality by using ADPCM when only one handset is off-hook (see, e.g., Iyengar, col. 8, lines 27-27), but allowing advantages of multiple handsets communicating with only one base unit by dividing the single RF channel (sized for a single ADPCM data stream) into multiple sub-channels ALL using the same encoding scheme.

The present invention provides that two different types of coding schemes are implemented simultaneously in opposite directions of the same full-duplex audio path to form an unbalanced coding in a digital cordless telephone. The cited Iyengar reference teaches use of balanced coding (i.e., the same coding at the same time in both transmission directions) to optimize system cost and performance. (Specification, page 16, lines 7-11)

For at least all the above reasons, claims 1-3, 5, 10-15, 17-21, 23, 25 and 26 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 4, 6-9, 16, 22 and 24-27 over Iyengar and Borland

Claims 4 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Iyengar; and claims 6-9, 16 and 24-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Iyengar in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,343,217 to Borland ("Borland"). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Iyengar is NOT available as PRIOR ART under 35 USC 103(c), as Iyengar and the present invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

In particular, Iyengar was owned by Lucent Technologies Inc. at the time the present invention was made. Moreover, as the Assignment in the present application will confirm, the present invention was assigned to Lucent Technologies at the time the invention was made.

The rejection based on Iyengar alone is mooted. Moreover, the rejection based on the combination of Iyengar and Borland cannot stand on its face on Borland alone, as the Examiner utilizes Iyengar as the base reference, and for allegedly providing crucial teachings.

For these and other reasons, claims 4, 6-9, 16, 22 and 24-27 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



William H. Bollman
Reg. No. 36,457

MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC
2000 M Street, NW
Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036-3307
TEL. (202) 261-1020
FAX. (202) 887-0336